

10

LUC-439/Florkey 13-7-3

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-5 and 25-31 are pending in the application. Claims 6-24 were withdrawn. Claims 1-4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a). Claims 5 and 25 were allowed.

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

OCT 24 2006

**Allowable Subject Matter**

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's indication that claims 5 and 25 contain allowable subject matter.

**Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,643,291 issued to Yoshihara on November 4, 2003 in view of U.S. Patent Application Number 20030231338 issued to Haga on December 18, 2003.

Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as unpatentable over Yoshihara and Haga in view of U.S. Patent Application Number 20050058260 issued to Lasenski on March 17, 2005.

Claims 1-4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lasenski in view of Haga.

**Rejection Under Yoshihara and Haga**

Claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,643,291 issued to Yoshihara in view of Haga.

Applicants have avoided this ground of rejection for the following reasons.

Applicants' claim 1, as amended, now recites,

"a gateway component that provides an identifier of a service provider to a sender of the message through employment of a user address associated with a recipient of the message, wherein the identifier is a logo associated with the service provider, and wherein the user address comprises a directory number and a Universal Resource Indicator (URI)."

Best Available Copy

As stated in the Office Action Yoshihara does not teach "the identifier is a logo" limitation. Also, Yoshihara does not teach the "user address comprises a directory number and a Universal Resource Indicator (URI)" limitation either. This is because Yoshihara discloses subscribers having telephone numbers, e.g., DNs, and routers having IP addresses, as shown in FIGs. 24-26. However, contrary to applicants' claim 1, Yoshihara does not disclose a "user address comprises a directory number and a Universal Resource Indicator (URI)". Thus, Yoshihara does not supply the elements of applicants' claim 1.

Haga does not teach the limitation either. Instead, Haga discloses a sender's mail address and a server's IP address. However, contrary to applicants' claim 1, Haga, similar to Yoshihara, does not disclose a "user address comprises a directory number and a Universal Resource Indicator (URI)". Thus, Haga does not supply the elements of applicants' claim 1.

Thus, the clear teaching of Yoshihara and Haga is that the user address is not a directory number and a Universal Resource Indicator (URI).

Therefore the combination of Yoshihara with Haga does not teach or suggest all of the limitations in applicants' claim 1, and therefore claim 1 is allowable over the proposed combination. Since claims 2-4 depend from allowable claim 1, these claims are also allowable over Yoshihara and Haga.

#### Rejections Under Yoshihara, Lasenski and Haga

Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as unpatentable over Yoshihara and Haga in view of Lasenski.

Claims 1-4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lasenski in view of Haga.

Applicants respectfully traverse this ground of rejection.

This rejection is based on the rejection under Yoshihara and Haga being proper. As that ground of rejection has been overcome, and none of the cited references teach or suggest "wherein the user address comprises a directory number and a Universal Resource Indicator (URI)", as recited in applicants' independent claim 1, the combination of Yoshihara, Haga and Lasenski does not supply this missing element.

Best Available Copy

12

LUC-439/Florkey 13-7-3

Thus, this combination does not make obvious any of applicants' claims, all of which require the aforesaid limitation.

#### New Claims

New claims 26-31 have been added. Claims 26-31 provide additional limitations for the gateway component. Claims 26-31 are submitted to be allowable based on their dependency from allowable claim 5. No new matter has been added.

Best Available Copy

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

LUC-439/Florkey 13-7-3


OCT 24 2006

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the Office Action's rejections have been overcome and that this application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance are, therefore, respectfully solicited.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, allowance of all claims pending is respectfully requested. If a telephone conference would be of assistance in advancing the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call applicants' attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Carmen B. Patti  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 26,784

Dated: October 24, 2006

CARMEN B. PATTI & ASSOCIATES, LLC  
Customer Number 47382

Best Available Copy